

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

March 19, 2001

6:00 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Wihby, Clancy, Cashin, Lopez

Messrs: B. Jabjiniak, R. Ludwig, R. Johnson, R. MacKenzie, S. Maranto,
K. Sheppard

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Resolutions:

"Amending the 2001 Community Improvement Program,
authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen
Thousand Eighty Dollars (\$13,080) for FY2001 CIP 510601 Park
Improvement Program."

"Amending the 2001 Community Improvement Program,
authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred
Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000) for 2001 CIP 650701 Bond
Building Renovation Project."

Alderman Wihby moved that the Resolutions ought to pass. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil asked so if we don't set something up with one of those two agencies it goes into the general fund and can't be used for future economic development.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered that is correct unless you specify for it.

Chairman O'Neil asked do we need to take action on that tonight.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered I would like some direction on it tonight, that is correct.

Alderman Lopez asked why does it have to be done tonight. I think we need a little time to think about whether we are going to take the \$150,000 and put it back there or use the \$150,000 in the City portion.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered the only reason I wanted to deal with it tonight was so we could deal with it once and it fresh in our mind and we can move forward. If you want to take some time and address that issue at the next meeting, you need to keep it on the agenda in terms of the repayment issue. Not necessarily the approval, but the repayment issue.

Alderman Lopez stated the repayment issue I would like to know, personally, maybe from the Finance Officer or somebody to know whether this is a good move on our part to send it back to MHA. They have \$900,000 there so maybe they should start getting some return in that area.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied now that we are aware of the funding source, I think we will be looking at other alternatives for downtown especially.

Alderman Clancy asked, Bill, can this money be used for anything pertaining to CIP or does it have to be with MHA.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered basically it is for approved economic development activities. If that is included in the CIP, then certainly.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think it is great...you know in the discussions I have had in the past with the new Executive Director he is very interested in getting back to partnering with the City both on the housing side and on the redevelopment and economic development side so it might not be the end of the world to re-establish strong relationships with them. I agree that we don't necessarily have to settle this tonight.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated and we still have access to it. It is not like it is exclusively theirs. They are still going to work in conjunction with us but I just thought it was a great way to re-engage the Housing Authority.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

2001 CIP Budget Authorizations:

510601	Park Improvement Project - Revision #1
660701	Bond Building Renovation - Revision #2

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to approve the budget authorizations.

Alderman Clancy asked, Ron, can you tell me where these monies are going.

Mr. Ludwig answered I think as you are aware we have experienced some difficulties with this project right from the beginning. Just the site itself was difficult for us to come up with.

Chairman O'Neil stated we are still on number four.

Mr. Johnson stated this is a grant that we applied for. The grant was through the NH Department of Environmental Services and it is a water shed grant where they make funds available to do projects within the Piscataquog and Merrimack River water sheds. We are actually receiving a grant from the state. The total amount is just a little over \$20,000 and the state will be contributing \$13,000 to the City for that. The rest of the money comes from in-kind services working with volunteers who have been doing some work over there on the project.

Alderman Clancy asked are you talking over on Second Street.

Mr. Johnson answered no. This is right by the West Side Ice Arena where the main outfall is coming for the CSO program on the West Side where they are separating the sewer and the stone water. It is right underneath the Biron Bridge where the main utilities cross over to Goffstown. That is where the project will be located.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Director seeking authorization to utilize \$100,000 of their FY2002 CIP funding request to complete the site work at the Manchester Skate Park.

Mr. Ludwig stated just to give you a little history of this, we started the project with about \$150,000. We bid the project a couple of different times. The first time it came in way over budget. It was completely ridiculous. We tried a different approach by separating the contract into site work and also concrete work, which is a major part of the job. Of that \$150,000 we had about \$30,000 in contributions so one from one person and then some smaller ones from different individuals, actually kids who were interested in donating to the project. Since that time we did the demolition work of the old swimming pool that was there, removed that and trucked it away. Beyond that we excavated according to the

plan a hole and we have a floor board but the project in itself has been far more extensive than we determined that it would be in the original scope of the work. We are at a point now where we are retaining about \$90,000 to do the gunnite work to actually get the contours in to the park but prior to doing that we are going to need significant more dollars to get the excavation completed. We can't go to step 2 until we can get the excavation complete. That is why we are here asking for the additional dollars. We feel that at least if we can get the project going we have a contractor who is willing to come in and has looked at the job. Basically there is more of a job that most contractors have run from quite frankly than come forward to want to participate in.

Chairman O'Neil asked haven't there been a couple of years of funding.

Mr. Johnson answered there has been a few years. There was a small amount of about \$14,000 that was appropriated to the Planning Department initially to do the Master Plan design work.

Chairman O'Neil asked how much construction money have we approved to date.

Mr. Johnson answered to date there has been two years worth. The first year I believe it was around \$50,000 and I think this past year it was \$100,000 so it has been about \$150,000.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we have about \$164,000 into this.

Mr. Johnson answered right but that is our authorized budget. Part of that has been, as Ron mentioned, the contributions and the donations that have come into the park. It hasn't just been City money.

Chairman O'Neil asked how much was that.

Mr. Johnson answered approximately \$50,000 of that \$150,000. We had a donation from Coca-Cola and a series of other private donations.

Chairman O'Neil asked are we going after the contractor you terminated.

Mr. Ludwig answered at this point the answer to that is now.

Chairman O'Neil asked how come.

Mr. Ludwig answered I guess we could. We felt that the contractor who bid the site work originally really left quite a bit on the table and again that is up to him.

Chairman O'Neil stated I know that going after him doesn't solve getting this done and that is another issue but I think we should go after this guy and make sure that other departments know that he failed to perform. There must have been a bond, right?

Mr. Johnson replied yes. His contract was for approximately \$52,000. He did complete a majority of the work. We held his retainage and we have taken him off our bid list and have informed other departments.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we should go after him to be honest with you to recover whatever we can.

Alderman Lopez asked, Sam, will we get the money because this has to be expedited I am sure in order to get this project done. Do we have the money?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we are very hesitant at the present time to recommend to the Board that any 2002 money be committed. It is a very, very tight year for bonds. There are some serious issues that have to be resolved and I think the Board has to look at the whole pool of requests before it commits to individual projects because these will nibble away at your bonding capacity for the whole FY2002. Sam has reviewed with Parks perhaps some other ways to fund that and I would like him to describe how that could be done.

Mr. Maranto stated now that the project is on Maple Street it is eligible for CDBG funding which is previously was not. I have spoken to Ron about this. There are some balances in the Youth Recreation Program, approximately \$35,000. There are a couple of smaller amounts of funding from existing CIP projects that are being completed and we have some program income that we received recently that would total approximately \$100,000 and that is what I would suggest we utilize to get this done.

Chairman O'Neil asked can you give us a better...you gave us \$35,000 in Youth Recreation and then some and some.

Mr. Maranto answered it is about 1/3 of each. I didn't bring the information this evening, but I think there is about \$32,000 in existing CIP projects and then the balance would be program income. So about \$33,000 in program income.

Chairman O'Neil asked and that will be made available so they can get the contract and get this thing finished with a grand opening of around June 1.

Mr. Ludwig answered I would love to think so, yes.

Alderman Lopez moved to approve \$100,000 from existing CIP projects, program income and Youth Recreation Fund money to complete site work at the Manchester Skate Park. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy stated I hope we don't nickel and dime this Skateboard Park. First of all, I didn't know it was going over there. Second of all, it is a bad location. It is behind a building and is going to need plenty of lighting. Now as far as the shade shelter, is that going to go up this year before it opens up or is it going to be on hold?

Mr. Ludwig replied it is my opinion that it will be on hold for a time uncertain but our main objective here is to get the kids into this park and start using it and allowing them to skate. They have been extremely patient in my opinion and if we can get them in there then maybe that will cause some incentive for additional donations to come forward as well. Right now we don't have much to show them except a hole.

Alderman Clancy asked do we have the money for lighting at night.

Mr. Ludwig answered several years ago on another project we did the interior lighting along the alleyway there so it is really not too bad through there but we would not have money available for all of the lighting proposed for the project.

Alderman Clancy stated we have had rapes back there.

Mr. Ludwig replied we understand.

Alderman Shea asked where is that in relationship to the Teamsters Hall.

Mr. Ludwig answered just to the north.

Alderman Shea asked and you said there were what there. Rapes?

Alderman Clancy answered yes. There were two rapes to my knowledge.

Chairman O'Neil stated just for clarification, we are talking about taking approximately \$35,000 from Youth Recreation, approximately \$32,000 from CIP balances and the remainder from program income. We are not talking about the 2002 CIP budget?

Mr. Maranto replied correct.

Alderman Cashin asked am I right. Are we spending \$250,000 for this Skateboard Park?

Mr. Ludwig answered we will have close to that into it, yes.

Alderman Cashin stated that is an awful lot of money.

Alderman Lopez replied yes it is a lot of money and fortunately it is going to be one of the best Skateboard Parks in northern New England.

Alderman Cashin stated gentlemen I have told you this the last couple of years. Nobody has been keeping track of the bonding capacity for the City and we are going to be in trouble and you are going to hear it in the next budget.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked how many young people are skateboarding in the City would you say.

Mr. Ludwig answered that is difficult to answer. You have to travel throughout the City. They are all over. I think you are going to see a huge amount and ask me if that is going to be 100 because what will be a safe number in the confines of this park at one time I am not quite certain yet. I think you are going to see an extensive amount of kids that are all over the City on skateboards in parks and on benches and on decks of businesses and all over the place wanting to use this facility. One of the reasons why this facility is costing more than when you open up the paper and you see that Hooksett raised \$30,000 and put one in or another small community and those are all admirable things but this Skateboard Park is being built and designed so hopefully it will last and it is really what the kids who are skateboarding want to use. We didn't want to build something that they had no interest in coming to and then continued to skateboard on decks of businesses and benches and places where people really didn't want to see them.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked the answer is you think there are about 100 young people that skateboard in the City.

Mr. Ludwig answered no. I am sure there are hundreds throughout the City. I have two in my family and there are 100 probably in my neighborhood. The most difficult part of this will be for us to manage how many kids want to be in there at one time.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so we are building a senior center eventually and hopefully that might take care of 50 to 100 people for \$4 million and this is \$250,000 for several hundred if not 1,000 people.

Mr. Ludwig replied right.

Alderman Clancy asked do you think we are going to attract people from outside the City like Auburn, Hooksett, and Candia.

Mr. Ludwig answered without a doubt.

Alderman Clancy stated that is what is going to happen. We are going to be babysitting those people and they are going to get hurt and the ambulances are going to be shuttling back and forth to the hospitals. Who is going to supervisor this? Are you going to have skateboard people down there?

Mr. Ludwig replied we probably will.

Chairman O'Neil stated we are into this thing now and it is too late to turn back. If people had concerns, you should have brought them forward before this project got started.

Alderman Cashin replied with no disrespect to the Chairman I don't think anybody realized it was going to cost \$264,000 either.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think Alderman O'Neil brought up a good point. Why would we even for one second not be looking to go after that bond?

Mr. Ludwig replied I am not going to try to defend them. At the time we had other issues with the same contractor on another job and that job was going well either. We withheld about \$50,000 or \$60,000 on another job that we used the same contractor on. Things weren't going well and without going into great detail, we really felt on this job that what we asked him to do for the majority of the time...it was a fact that he wasn't moving in a way and the job wasn't moving...he would come in and do a little bit and then that would collapse. Why did we not go after the bond? Our feeling was that if we go and litigate we would be talking about a Skateboard Park being built many, many moons from now as opposed to having it done in June.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Cashin being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Gatsas stated my question is maybe for the City Solicitor. Is it the decision of department heads on whether they want to pursue a bond or should that be a decision made by the full Board?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied I suppose it could be made by either party. Certainly if a department head came to us and said we think we ought to look at calling this bond we would certainly do that. Likewise if the Board did it we would do the same thing.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe that close to a year ago I made a motion that we go after the bond for the auditor based on the parking garages. What is the status of that?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied I couldn't tell you, Alderman.

Chairman O'Neil stated the problem that goes on here is this Board through its committees takes action and it goes nowhere. Two meetings ago at the civic center meeting I asked that the consultants be brought in to discuss naming rights and we are told tonight that it is not our business and we have to make the same motion again. When committees of the Board take action, it should be followed up. I think we should go after this person and I would entertain a motion on that.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to request that the City Solicitor call in the bond for the contractor due to failed performance.

Chairman O'Neil stated we do business with many contractors of all types and they fail to perform in many cases and we should be calling in more bonds in my opinion.

Alderman Lopez asked, Leo, do you follow-up with a letter when we make motions to the individuals to get us the information.

Clerk Bernier answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from the Chief of Police requesting the replacement of a damaged cruiser with a new vehicle from Irwin Motors under the State bid for \$23,270.00 utilizing up to \$4,620.00 in MER funds and \$18,650.00 from the City's self-insurance fund.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from the Public Works Director requesting acceptance and approval of the reallocation and commitment of other funds up to the total bond appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the Riverfront Development Project, as enclosed herein.

Alderman Clancy stated this \$4,000,000, I know we are going to have trouble. I was talking to Alderman Cashin about the bonding for FY2002 and \$4 million is a lot of money. I was told there was only \$7 million bondable through the CIP this year. Where is this \$4 million coming from?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the \$4 million has already been committed in past CIP's by the Board.

Alderman Clancy asked so this is just a formality. Is that what you are trying to say?

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Board still has some options. Much of that money has been committed. Roughly \$1.4 million has not been committed and there is a recommendation on that money in that report from Kevin.

Mr. Sheppard stated what we are looking at is this money has been committed to the Riverwalk and parking in the Millyard area. What we are doing is coming back and saying we want to commit this money to these areas within that. The bonds that were approved were basically \$1 million for the Riverwalk and \$1.2 million for parking in the Millyard area. What we are trying to do here is define where that money is going to be spent or further utilized.

Alderman Clancy asked so you are looking for \$4 million.

Mr. Sheppard answered no. The \$4 million exists right now.

Alderman Clancy asked so what is this \$1.4 million that is available.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is available that is currently uncommitted. Much of the money has already been committed for various portions from design to construction to other aspects of the Riverwalk and to this point there is \$1.4 million out of that \$4 million that is not committed towards a specific piece of the Riverwalk project or parking.

Chairman O'Neil stated it was, if you recall, with very short notice that we moved within the bond issue and reworked some money to build a parking deck at the Seal Tanning Lot but after the City had discussions with the owners and the major tenant of one of those buildings, it was determined that at this time it didn't make any sense to build it. All they are saying here if I may because I have had discussions with the Director as well as the Deputy Director is the \$1.4 million we have a parking reserve fund so that we are not...all of the sudden an opportunity comes along hustling and having battles to address parking needs.

Alderman Clancy stated my contention is if we are going to build a garage build it big enough. Not for 50 or 60 or 100 cars. Let's build it big enough.

Chairman O'Neil replied there is no recommendation to utilize that money today.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mr. Jabjiniak, the \$900,000 that you had remaining. Is there a possibility of using that for a parking garage in the Millyard?

Mr. Jabjiniak answered I would have to verify that to see if that is an eligible economic development project. It is certainly something we are going to look at.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if we took that \$900,000 and I believe there is \$1.4 million and another \$400,000 that hasn't gone anywhere yet that we can stop at this point...

Mr. Sheppard stated you have that funding sheet in front of you. At this point, we have \$2.155 million committed and we are looking to rescind the relocation of the power lines at Singer Park, which would be a \$50,000 credit and allocate Phase IB which is past the NYCOA property. We feel that is a very important project. Right now the Riverwalk is dead-ended at the south end. It does not go to a City property. This would bring the Riverwalk down to Sundial Avenue so we would have City property at either end of the Riverwalk project and we feel that is an important phase. That was actually part of the original Phase IA but we were still in negotiations with NYCOA at the time so we broke that contract out. We finished the negotiations and received the easement from NYCOA so we want to move forward with that. We are looking for \$95,000 for contingency. Basically we have a couple of large contracts out there and we need the money in contingency in case we run into some problems. Hopefully we won't need that but you are talking 10% contingency in the project work and that leaves a balance of \$1.4 million, which we would like to use for the parking.

Alderman Gatsas asked but the \$400,000 has not been spent.

Mr. Sheppard answered right.

Alderman Gatsas stated so we could change or reallocate that money to another position if we wanted to.

Mr. Sheppard replied if the Board so chose, yes.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree that the \$400,000 hasn't been spent but there is another \$95,000 that hasn't been committed in contingency.

Alderman Gatsas replied I used a total of \$2 million but I am short some \$45,000.

Chairman O'Neil stated in my discussion with the Director, he and City staff concur that we finish from the north end of Singer Park to Sundial Avenue with the money that has already been committed and the private effort that is going on with the bridge and there are monies that are already approved to start what I will call the Goffstown line but that is not the proper term. If we don't do anything else with the Riverwalk, at least we have that tie east to west and north to south. That is the intent. If we never build another section, at least there is that portion north of Singer Park southerly to Sundial Avenue with the bridge and with the Federal money that is available to do the Goffstown line. At least we would move forward.

Alderman Gatsas stated I understand, but I think that \$400,000 would be better spent at this time on things other than a walkway. That \$400,000 could be put towards the \$2 million and we would be somewhere around \$3 million to build a parking garage that is very much needed in the Millyard.

Chairman O'Neil replied that is fine.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if we could get another \$1 million to \$1.1 million somewhere in grants we probably could put up a 400 to 500 car garage.

Alderman Shea stated I concur. I think we have to have a list of priorities and this should not be up near the top because of bonding.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't have any problems switching here other than I spent some time with the Director and everyone is saying how important it is to finish the Riverwalk from the Queen City Bridge down. Mr. MacKenzie, have you been involved in this discussion because I just don't want to... Frank Thomas gave me the impression of how important it was with the Millyard owners and everybody else. Like I said I have no problem with switching in midstream here if it is important and somebody can prove the facts and numbers to build a garage and we have the money.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the Highway Department did present to a number of City staff like the Economic Development Director, Finance Director and City Solicitor this proposal that you are seeing and we concurred with it. I think the only issue that I had with that NYCOA extension is there has been some concern by the Police Department that this not be a dead ended trail and that it have access to a public roadway so that police personnel can get at either end. I know the Police Department has raised that issue on several occasions and this extension would bring it down to Sundial Avenue.

Alderman Lopez stated the next question is which is more important - the walkway and finishing off the southern portion of going after a parking garage.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think that is a policy question for the Board to answer.

Alderman Clancy stated right now I see that the parking garage should have preference over the Riverwalk because once the civic center is opened up we are going to have major problems here in the City with parking. We have to get off our tails and start getting a garage built here as soon as possible. From what I am hearing from the people in the inner City area, they don't want parking meters on their street and they don't want this or that. They said we should have had a parking garage built before the civic center because right now people are saying what is going to happen when we have an event at the civic center. People are going to be up in arms and we are going to have a big fight here amongst the City residents.

Chairman O'Neil called a recess to allow the public hearing to take place.

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting back to order.

Chairman O'Neil stated we are still on Item 7. We have a lot of differing opinions tonight, many of which are towards parking and some are talking Millyard or other spots in the City. Might it be appropriate until we figure out where the CIP budget is going to table this issue?

Alderman Cashin moved to table this item.

Alderman Clancy stated we have to get off our duffer and get that parking going as soon as possible because I am telling you as soon as the civic center opens up we are going to have big problems in the City here with the parking.

Chairman O'Neil asked which parking are you talking about.

Alderman Clancy answered we need a parking garage mainly in the Millyard to be utilized during the day for people who work downtown and at night for the people going to the civic center.

Mr. Sheppard stated right now we have asked our parking consultant, HTA, to start taking a look at putting together two proposals for us which we currently have under review. We want them to take a look at downtown parking needs, as well as Millyard parking needs. I do know there have been a lot of studies. In this final study we are looking to consolidate these with the civic center information and take a look at potentially where a parking garage or a parking lot could fit. We want to consolidate the existing parking studies and give the City one final report that would be used for the future.

Alderman Clancy stated it might be fine right now, Kevin, to shuttle people when there is no snow, but once the snow gets on the ground, people don't want to be shuttled from one garage to another. I am telling you. They don't want to go from the Victory Parking Garage to Lake Ave. and Elm Street. You need a garage down in the Millyard so it can be utilized for the people who work there during the daytime and at night maybe we can use the Center of NH or the Victory garage. If you are going to have anywhere between 8,000 to 12,000 people at any kind of event here, we need parking. They won't want to come.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think in defense of the director what he is trying to do is take all of the reports and there are numerous reports out there...take what is good information and what is not appropriate information and come out with a final report taking into mind what we started with Rubenstein and the grant money to build a garage there. I think tabling this is an appropriate motion. Your message is certainly clear, Alderman Clancy.

Alderman Lopez stated I think tabling it is a good idea because it is not going to go anywhere tonight. I think it is very important that we have the experts tell us on this parking garage...I have heard 10,000 spaces, I have heard 15,000 spaces, I have heard 18,000 spaces so when you do come back in reference to this subject and we are going to talk about a parking garage, let's get some good expertise information so that the Committee can make a true decision and whatever other details that the Director has mentioned about the...and the Police mentioned also that they wanted it done and the staff wanted it done. All of these people and you are sitting here alone saying you want it done. I don't understand that. I really don't. I am not criticizing you but I think we are going to have to hear from the expert as to which direction we are going to go in to make a logical decision. Naturally, parking is a major priority and most likely that is the way we will go. At least we will hear both sides of the story.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Kevin, why do I think there is another \$1.3 million for another parking lot, not the Seal Tanning one but another one. Isn't there another \$1.3 million of parking money around.

Mr. Sheppard answered I am not familiar with that.

Alderman Gatsas asked down at the Bedford Lot.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there have been discussions about a couple of other lots like at the Jefferson Mill they were looking for a \$1.3 million lot, but there was never any money appropriated for it. There was discussion.

Alderman Gatsas asked there wasn't another deck appropriated somewhere else in the Millyard.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I don't believe so.

Chairman O'Neil stated not that I remember. The only other thing is they are constructing the Rubenstein Parking Lot down at South Commercial Street and there has been discussion. I don't know if we received final approval to build a 400 or 600 car garage from the state that the state would pay for.

Mr. Sheppard stated it is on the opposite side I believe from the track to Rubenstein.

Chairman O'Neil replied I don't recall. There were serious discussions about the Jefferson Mill but that kind of faded way.

Alderman Gatsas stated I could have sworn that there was another \$1.3 million somewhere.

Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion to table this item. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Communication from the Manchester School District requesting approval of a matching grant in the amount of \$723,152 for the Bakersville Kindergarten Construction Grant Program and noting that 25% matching fund plus site acquisition costs will be required.

Chairman O'Neil stated this was actually on our full Board agenda for tomorrow night, but if we don't take some action tonight they will never make an April 1 deadline and the business administrator is here, Ron Chapman, and I will turn it over to you.

Mr. Chapman stated thank you for allowing us to move this up. I think this would have been here a few weeks ago except for a snowstorm that delayed a lot of things. Basically in a nutshell the state has put together through the Governor's Office a 75% grant for new construction on kindergarten. This project has been around and basically what had happened was that they were waiting for many of these reports between NESDEC, Parsons-Brinckerhoff, etc. to come forth. The problem we have is we are like number one on the list of non-committed funding, which means that if we don't do something by April 1 this money very well may go to other districts in the state and we would be out of luck. We did have a proposal and we do have a proposal to build four classrooms at Bakersville so we are going to go with that proposal in order to lock in the 75% money from the state. The state has told us that should we, after reviewing all of the current demographics, etc., chose not to go with this particular location that we would be able to utilize the money at any other location. Our 25% match plus any site costs would probably and I say probably but it is 90% probability, come forth in a 2003 CIP budget. There would be no money being requested this year because by the time we get all of our ducks in a row and get our demographic information, etc. there would probably be construction in late FY02 or early FY03. In other words, we would start construction possibly as late as May/June to try and have the kids in a kindergarten by September of 2003. Really, the purpose of this is to lock in the state funding for the City of Manchester.

Chairman O'Neil asked would the 25% need to be in the FY2002 CIP budget.

Mr. Chapman answered no. We are going to put it in the 2003. There are a couple of issues...

Chairman O'Neil interjected if you put it in 2003 there is no way the construction could be done for students to attend the addition in the fall of 2003. Well actually it is fiscal year 2002-2003.

Mr. Chapman replied right. We have put up or at least I have been involved with putting up different classrooms in other districts that I have been involved in starting with basically going out to bid in February or March and having it all totally constructed by September/October.

Chairman O'Neil stated they are building an addition. I don't think the way we have been doing the history of doing things...I don't know if you were listening in on this, Kevin but Ron is saying that we could...Ron why don't you just repeat what you said for Alderman Wihby and Kevin.

Mr. Chapman stated what I am saying is that this construction project would probably not be put into the FY2002 CIP but we would put in for FY2003. I think that having all of our ducks in a row by February/March and having gone out to bid and be ready to construct in late May or early June with a start date because the state is going to give us 75% of this money as we start the project off. We would be able to start early enough to complete construction by September and at the latest October.

Chairman O'Neil asked based on the way that the City does business and we even fast track our CIP, that is generally not until April so could a four classroom addition be built from April and be ready to occupy that September.

Mr. Sheppard answered I think we would be on a very tight construction schedule. I think anything can be done. It depends on what you are willing to pay for it. You might end up paying a little bit more if you tighten the construction schedule. I think it can be done. I would prefer if we could get the bid out a little bit early. I wasn't aware of the dates that you were discussing but if we could get the bid out a little bit earlier and have the contractor line up the sub-contractors and his materials...

Chairman O'Neil interjected my point, Ron, is should it be considered as part of next year's CIP budget.

Mr. Chapman replied I think our problem, city wide our problem is that if we try to keep putting \$100,000 or \$200,000 here and there into FY2002 we are going to have a problem. That is one of the reasons, I think, that the School Department said we would be happy...we won't have all of our ducks in a row in order to get into FY2002 unless it happens to fall at the end of the FY2002 cycle.

Chairman O'Neil asked would it be possible for you to speak to Kevin tomorrow and see if you guys can agree on a timeline and if we do do it in the FY2002 CIP budget if that is practical to get this project done.

Alderman Lopez stated so based on the Tenant & Wallace Architect, the state is going to give you \$965,000. The last time this architect did something it cost quite a bit for square footage. Did this go through the process of the site committee and the Joint School Committee or just the School Board?

Mr. Chapman replied this has gone through the Building & Sites Committee at the School District. It has also gone through the entire School Board and it then came here. It did not go through the Joint School Building Committee. I think this is one of the other reasons that from my perspective we are better off talking about the FY2003 CIP budget for a few reasons. One being that we want to make sure that the Aldermen have a second shot at this from the perspective of do you want to put it up in the FY2003 when we come back with all of the numbers because if for whatever reason all of the population disappears from Bakersville it may not be the ideal location to put the kindergarten.

Chairman O'Neil stated one thing that the City Clerk just pointed out was whether this Board can commit for next year. We don't know if we can commit for a future Board so that is a problem.

Mr. Chapman replied I am not looking for a commitment other than the commitment to build a kindergarten and can we do that. If it has to come in to FY2002 then we will put it in the FY2002 but I would rather talk about having it for the benefit of everybody in FY2003.

Alderman Lopez stated that is why I am a little confused here. We are committing...if we say okay you go and get the money and we have committed to 25%. We will be committed to build a kindergarten based on the facts that have been given without going through a Joint Committee process. What happens down the road if we get the money and the Joint Committee looks at it and decides it is not a very good idea to do it down there? I don't know what legal commitment we would have. Does the Solicitor have an answer?

Mr. Chapman stated from my perspective or just looking at how this needs to work, what we are looking for is a commitment to build a kindergarten in the City. Currently, our plan is to build it at Bakersville. Our plan would be to start construction late FY2002 but obviously at this point I don't have all of the specific data to construct that. We know we are going to build a kindergarten and we know that we want to build a kindergarten because we can get the 75% state aid. That is what our impetus is in doing. How we fund it I guess comes back to...what I don't want the Board to do is commit to a number today as far as total dollars to be funded because we are not sure that...unfortunately we are not 100% sure that Bakersville is going to be the location.

Alderman Lopez replied I understand that. I realize what you are saying but if we say yes to this, you go and submit for the money from the state.

Mr. Chapman responded no. We notify the state that we have approval to construct but we would not get any money from the state until we had a construction schedule that they would require as well as a pay out schedule to the contractor.

Alderman Lopez asked would you have to tell the state that we have okayed 25%.

Mr. Chapman answered we would tell the state that we approved the plan as it stands for Bakersville.

Alderman Clancy asked, Ron, we don't have an open pocketbook here per say. We are going to build four rooms at Bakersville. Are you going to be buying the land on Cheney Place down there or is that lot big enough to put the addition on?

Mr. Chapman answered that is why I think this whole thing is up in the air because I am not sure that...this project started out in 1998 and it was thought to be an ideal situation but at that point it didn't get through CIP from what I understand.

Alderman Clancy replied I am not against it. Bakersville School is in one of the most dangerous intersections in the City. We don't have any other schools you can put four rooms on for kindergarten?

Mr. Chapman responded I think the problem, Alderman, is that all of the paperwork that went to the state was angled towards Bakersville when it went up there so the state is looking at Bakersville for the project and that is why they said we could divert the money. I don't have an opinion whether Bakersville is the spot or not.

Alderman Clancy replied well the last sentence here says, "should the project not be feasible at Bakersville, we may apply to have the approved funds designated to another existing site." You must have a back-up site. There must be one.

Mr. Chapman responded at this point I don't know of any back-up site. We have places in the City obviously. We have many schools, but personally I don't know of a specific back-up site.

Alderman Clancy stated somewhere in here it talks about buying houses and land and stuff. I am not against it. I will tell you that right now.

Mr. Chapman replied that again is the reason why I thought we should do it out of the FY2003 CIP budget.

Alderman Clancy stated if we can work it into the FY2002 budget I am for it.

Alderman Gatsas stated this shouldn't be a difficult decision. This is like found money that says we will give you \$750,000 if you put up \$250,000 and if the School Department decides that they want to put it at Bakersville, they will be making that decision and I think all Ron is looking for is...hey we just found \$100,000 for a Skateboard Park. I have to believe we can find \$250,000 for kindergarten if we need to find it.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Ron, do you know where this would be on your priority list.

Mr. Chapman answered no.

Chairman O'Neil stated well you must have submitted a priority list to the CIP staff and the Mayor's Office.

Mr. Chapman replied the unfortunate part on this was that this was not on the priority list at all for CIP.

Alderman Clancy asked is that right.

Alderman Gatsas stated because this money is available it has to be dealt with by April 1 or it is going to be gone.

Alderman Wihby asked is there anything on your priority list that you are going to get funds for that you would prefer rather than this or is this the deal because of the 75% and you want to take care of it.

Mr. Chapman answered I think what we are trying to do...I found out unfortunately the disadvantage of being the kid that got here just eight months ago is that this popped up sometime in February after we had already submitted the priority list and we had already revised the priority list once. I didn't feel comfortable going back and prioritizing the list a second time and taking off some other project. I think in answer to your question when we found out that we had the \$723,000 sitting there committed to us and what we needed was BMA approval, then my goal was to try and get BMA approval. Now how I need to do that, I probably need some guidance from Mr. MacKenzie.

Alderman Wihby asked are you looking for the \$242,000 from the City side out of CIP. Is that the number?

Mr. Chapman answered I am not looking for anything from the City side at this point because as Alderman Clancy brought up if we are going to end up having to buy property it is probably going to be more than \$242,000. That may be a reason not to put the site at Bakersville.

Alderman Wihby asked but if it is not \$242,000, are you getting more than the \$750,000 or not?

Mr. Chapman answered we would if...

Alderman Wihby interjected so if the price goes up are you still going to get more on the other side. So it is always going to be 25%?

Mr. Chapman replied on a straight price increase, it will be 25% for construction. The problem is that the state will not give us money for land acquisition and so that is one of the reasons from...again being the new guy here I am not ready to tell you that we are not only going to spend \$250,000 because if somebody say it should be at Bakersville and it costs us \$200,000 to buy the land, we are going to have to come up with \$450,000.

Alderman Wihby asked so are we doing this because there is this deal out there.

Mr. Chapman answered yes.

Alderman Wihby asked is this something that we need.

Mr. Chapman answered I believe we would love to have another full-time kindergarten in the City.

Alderman Wihby asked was there a recommendation to have another full-time kindergarten out of the study.

Mr. Chapman answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked for clarification even the balance of \$242,000 is eligible for 30% building aid right.

Mr. Chapman answered right.

Alderman Shea asked, Ron, the contract with Easter Seals I believe is going to be expiring in another year. That is where the children that are in preschool are going. Years back there was a discussion to put an addition onto McDonough School or to add something to McDonough School. I think several of the

Aldermen, including Aldermen Clancy and Sysyn and others felt that that might be a very good way of killing two birds with one stone. Now could this particular project be applicable to say not purchasing land at Bakersville School but adding different classrooms up at McDonough School in order to alleviate because some how or other there has to be some decision. We are renting the Easter Seal building for quite a bit of money and I guess a decision would have to be made to either renew the rental there or to do something. Could that be an option that you might consider to use this money?

Mr. Chapman answered unfortunately the 75% must be used for kindergarten construction.

Alderman Shea asked just kindergarten. In other words all of the rooms have to be occupied by kindergarten children?

Mr. Chapman answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked could there be something set-up where kindergarten children could be utilizing that particular facility. The kids that presently go to McDonough and the kids that go to say Smyth Road. Could that be an option as well?

Mr. Chapman answered as I said I am not that familiar with all of the elementary schools and which schools currently have a kindergarten program but...

Alderman Shea interjected they all have them.

Mr. Chapman stated then I think it comes down to really a demographics issue that we have not had time to look at at this point. As I said, all of this data was sitting up at the state with Bakersville's name on it. It seemed to be the expedient thing to try to get the money for Bakersville and then taking a period of time to look at this before we went any further and then saying okay if Bakersville is the site that is fine and then coming back and asking for the dollars we would need. Now, I think that is why I was looking at possibly coming back next spring with that. The timeline back and forth between the City and the School District and the State, I think we could fit it all in but again if there is a problem with the legality of that, we don't want to push that.

Alderman Shea asked are all of these rooms going to be for kindergarten children.

Mr. Chapman answered yes there will be four rooms.

Alderman Shea asked and there are that many kids who will be going to Bakersville.

Mr. Chapman answered currently we are bussing them in from different areas to fill the classrooms that we currently have.

Alderman Levasseur stated I agree with Alderman Gatsas. There is no reason for us not to be going forward with this. This is found money and you are going to look like a hero in CIP Mr. O'Neil if you get those four rooms put in over at Bakersville. I will tell you why. If you can get it down in those area where those kids can get into school even a year earlier, that is very good for them to get trained in how to go to school at a very young age and if you can get them out of their houses and into school, we should move on this and I hope you put it in the FY2002 budget. You will get a lot of support from this Alderman.

Alderman Wihby asked can you just go back, that second paragraph says that it was sent to the CIP. It came to the District Capital Improvement Plan. That is your own Capital Improvement Plan? What does that second paragraph mean?

Mr. Chapman answered I think it came forward in 1998. It went through the Building & Sites Committee as an approved item to come to City CIP but I think that at that point it just did not cut the grade as far as issues. It could very well have been issues that we had and not necessarily issues that the Aldermen had.

Alderman Wihby asked so it has passed the School Board and all of the Committees there and when it came to CIP last year, someone decided it wasn't a priority.

Mr. Chapman answered I believe it said September of 1998 for the 1999 CIP.

Alderman Wihby stated so that would have been last year. So last year someone decided it wasn't a priority and it was the same conditions as this? 75% and all of this other stuff?

Mr. Chapman replied yes.

Alderman Wihby asked so why wasn't it a good idea last year.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I don't have an answer except that it was not high on the School Board's priority list last year either. It did not get into the...the top seven of their priorities last year were funded but it was well below the top seven last year.

Alderman Wihby stated so it was recommended from the School Board and it came to us and when we review all of the CIP requests we cut it off at number seven or the Mayor did.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I believe that is the way it worked. It was roughly number seven last year.

Alderman Wihby asked so the Mayor decided I am going to fund these seven because this is all the money I have and that is going to be it. The Aldermen never even saw it then because we just went by the Mayor's proposal?

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Aldermen did get copies of the request sheets from the School Board.

Alderman Wihby stated nobody came from the School Board to ask for it then.

Mr. MacKenzie replied not specifically. Again, they were funding in order that the School Board requested. It was just that it was so far down that it did not get funded.

Alderman Wihby stated that was for last year. So for this year that we are in, did they come forward with this proposal again?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I don't believe that this project was on their request list this year.

Alderman Wihby responded I guess where I am coming from is it seems like this is a no brainer but if it wasn't...what has changed from where it is not on their request to all of the sudden we should get it down. It sounds like you are given this pot of money over here and we have to get that pot of money no matter if we need it or not. They said let's go for that 75% and never mind what else we might be able to do with the other \$250,000 if we had it to take care of our priority list.

Mr. Chapman stated I believe that what had happened and what the differential is is that last year there was still somewhere in the neighborhood of \$12 million sitting out there in the pool from the state and it looked like it was going to be there through June of 2002. Our latest information from the state is that if it is not acquired this year there will be no money in 2002 to be allocated. Places such as Londonderry and some of these other towns have some sizable projects and this is one of the reasons I am sitting here tonight asking you to make this change for us because it has become such a priority otherwise we would lose it all together. I think that last year the people who were involved with the School District said we

can go with our other priorities because this money is still going to be there for another two years.

Alderman Wihby stated so knowing that you can't go into FY2003 and it has to go into FY2002, that means that...again you are not going to get a number and then add to the number. You are going to lose something within those line items that is going to cost you \$250,000 or \$400,000 or whatever it ends up being. Is the School Board willing to do that? Is that the recommendation is that if that is what we have to do we will do that and cut our priorities to do this? We are going to end up Ron in a budget and the Mayor is going to come up with a number and he is going to say I funded this down here and the School is going to say wait a minute that is number 18 and you didn't do number 5 through 18 and he is going to say well yes but you wanted to move this up and you are going to say no we wanted that in addition to what we wanted from up here and it is not going to happen. You are going to get the cut from someplace. Are you saying that they are willing to accept that?

Mr. Chapman replied personally I am not willing to accept it. I haven't brought it to the Board in those kinds of terms. I think the issues that we know we have with the facilities at the School District...if somebody says is this \$450,000 a high enough priority, is it above a Southside classroom addition or is it above some of the work we have going on at Central in the CIP for next year, I would be probably foolish to sit here and tell you that this is much more important than that.

Chairman O'Neil asked but Ron how many of those projects have a 75% match with 30% of the balance reimbursed by the state.

Alderman Wihby stated only if it is necessary. Only if it was one of the recommendations that somebody said you should do this within the next five years. Did somebody say you should open a new kindergarten and fix those buildings at Bakersville?

Mr. Chapman replied in the budget for this year we started out with expanding some kindergarten classrooms to a full session because we have many that are half a day sessions.

Alderman Wihby asked is Bakersville one of them.

Mr. Chapman answered that I don't know. Unfortunately Cathy had to leave to go to another meeting at 7:30 PM.

Alderman Wihby asked when you did the budget this year and because you are a district and have to come up with your own bonding, did you actually submit

something or were you given a number for bonding and asked what projects you want or did the Mayor pick them. How did you get to that number in the budget?

Mr. Chapman answered basically the number that is currently in the budget is the number for bonding projects that have already been committed. If there are new projects that are going to be committed through bonds, we would get a new number during the budget process from Kevin Clougherty and we would have to add that in.

Alderman Wihby asked so all the talk about Central being done and spending millions on rehabbing the buildings and all of that, none of that is in the current CIP proposal that the Mayor is going to present.

Mr. Chapman answered correct.

Alderman Wihby asked well you don't know if the Mayor is going to present it or not, but at least in your numbers it wasn't there.

Mr. Chapman answered right.

Alderman Wihby asked so when you asked for the \$114 million or whatever it was, that had nothing to do with any additional bonding requirements for anything that is going to be done in the future.

Mr. Chapman answered none.

Alderman Wihby asked why wouldn't you have included that.

Mr. Chapman answered because at the time we submitted our proposal to the Mayor, the Task Force report hadn't been completed and, therefore, we did not choose to supercede what they might come up with.

Alderman Wihby stated well you could have added two or three dollars or something to the number and said we are going to use an extra \$500,000 a year for bonding for stuff that comes up and here is our new rate.

Mr. Chapman replied I think we could have done that except that in doing that then that number is going to change. My goal is to have a solid number to start with rather than adding \$500,000 and then somebody is going to ask me the question where did that come from.

Alderman Wihby asked when are we going to have that number from the School Department to add to your number.

Mr. Chapman answered the Building & Sites Committee is meeting on Monday night and at that point we will give them our proposal. We had that discussion with the Mayor today.

Alderman Wihby asked so there will be something coming to us. It maybe is not in there now but by the time the Aldermen get it there will be? That is the plan?

Mr. Chapman answered yes.

Alderman Lopez stated one of the recommendations...what happens if the School Board decided to tear down Bakersville. Can we take it and build someplace else?

Mr. Chapman replied yes. I think we probably are not going to be tearing down any buildings even though NESDEC I know suggested that but part of the situation that we are in is that the Task Force after they got the report in December only had time enough for this CIP go round to make a recommendation on high schools. We still do not have their recommendations on middle schools or elementary schools, which was the other reason that we do not want to necessarily link this strongly to Bakersville. I think that we have to do it because that is where the paperwork is, but if we can put this facility someplace else, we probably will.

Alderman Lopez asked before I vote then, this is the number one priority for the School Department.

Mr. Chapman answered no. I think that obviously McLaughlin would be number one and I forget what number two was but I think that number two and number three revolved around Central and some of the projects that were at Central, as well as West, as well as possibly Memorial on a couple of issues.

Alderman Clancy stated we are going to sit here all night hashing this over, but when we are getting 75% of the money to build four classrooms from the state, we can't let that slip away. We have to go along with this right now.

Alderman Clancy moved to authorize the Bakersville School Kindergarten Construction Grant to proceed; and that the related funds be appropriated by the Board in the upcoming FY2002 CIP budget process. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

8. Communication from the Director of Planning submitting a copy of a contractor's estimate in the amount of \$152,750.00 to make repairs to the Blood Mausoleum.
(Tabled 2/13/01)

This item remained on the table.

9. Ordinance Amendment:

"Amending Section 37.03, "Advisory board" by inserting new language prohibiting persons holding positions within the entity association, or organization designated by the Advisory Board to manage services within the Central Business Service District from serving as members of the Advisory Board."

(Tabled 01/09/01 pending further information from Messrs. MacKenzie and Muller.)

This item remained on the table.

10. Communication from Robert S. MacKenzie submitting information on HOME projects under Manchester Neighborhood Housing Services as requested by the CIP Committee.
(Tabled 11/28/00)

Chairman O'Neil stated you should have received tonight a handout with regards to HOME projects under Manchester Neighborhood Housing Services. We only received this tonight. I feel bad for the staff from NHS for sitting here all night but we only received this as we came in the door tonight. Again, I apologize but I don't think it would necessarily be appropriate to take this up tonight. We haven't had a chance to review it. I apologize to the staff for sitting here. Absolutely positively this will be taken up at the next meeting.

Alderman Lopez asked can we take a couple of minutes and have them explain a little bit about this so we know what we are looking at. Can somebody do that?

Mr. MacKenzie answered if we are going to explain, we do have some slightly revised sheets and I hate to throw them at you at the last minute...

Chairman O'Neil interjected how can we have revised sheets when these just got handed out tonight.

Mr. MacKenzie replied because this is in constant flux. We have been working with NHS to get these done. We will be presenting these...

Chairman O'Neil interjected we are taking this up at the next meeting.

11. Copy of a communication from the Deputy Finance Officer to Alderman Gatsas relative to funding options for Millyard parking facilities.
(Tabled 9/18/00)

This item remained on the table.

12. Communication from the Director of Planning regarding the possible land acquisition of a piece of property on the westerly edge of Wolf Park.
(Tabled 9/18/00)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee